

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully notes two discrepancies in the Examiner's categorization of the claims. In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that:

Claims 1-16 and 23-25 are drawn to a method; and

Claims 17-23 are drawn to a product by process.

However, claims 1-16 and 23-26 are drawn to a method; claims 17-22 are drawn to a product by process. Applicant assumes that the discrepancies are due to typographical errors.

Accordingly, claims 1-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1-26 are subject to a restriction requirement.

Election of one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

Group I: Claims 1-16 and 23-26, drawn to a method;

Group II: Claims 17-22, drawn to a product by process.

In response to the Restriction Requirement set forth in the Office Action, Applicant hereby elects Group 1, claims 1-16 and 23-26, for examination, without traverse or prejudice from pursuing the withdrawn claims in a subsequent co-pending application.

Claims 17-22 have been withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present claims. In the event the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of this application which could be clarified by a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 5th day of June, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,



JOHN C. STRINGHAM
Registration No. 40,831
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913

dff
2334692_1.DOC